

REMARKS

Claims 1-48 are pending.

Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Godfrey (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,479 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites “a signing interface, the signing interface adapted to be invoked by a Web application transmitted to the browser from a remote location.” The signing interface of claim 1 provides a mechanism by which a seller’s Web applications may invoke the buyer’s smartcard subsystem or other signing module to execute a digital signature (specification, pg. 2, lines 16-18). The Examiner asserts that this limitation is met by an application transmitted from the remote web server (unit 106). In other words, the Examiner asserts that unit 106 of Godfrey transmits a web application to unit 104. Respectfully, the Examiner is incorrect.

Godfrey discloses a system which facilitates digital signatures between a first unit and a second unit through an interface independent proxy interposed between the first and second units (abstract). Unit 106 is referred to as the second unit (see Fig. 1, for example). Godfrey discloses that unit 106 is a software application, web browser on a network computer node, or another entity that communicates data, such as markup language based form data (col. 4, lines 25-28). Godfrey discloses that unit 106 generates markup language data 119 that includes embedded transaction initialization data along with form data to the independent proxy 110, and the independent proxy then applies a digital signature and sends this information out as form data with embedded digital initiation data 122 (col. 4, line 65 to col. 5, line 3). Godfrey further discloses that unit 106 communicates data with the digital signature initiation data through independent proxy 110 (col. 5, lines 14-15).

What Godfrey *fails* to disclose is that a web application is transmitted from unit 106 to unit 104. In fact, to do so would be unnecessary because Godfrey discloses that the protocol proxies 108 and 110, which are independent of units 104 and 106, facilitate a type of universal interface so that the units may be used with any suitable web browser which either contains digital signature

capability or other application which fails to include such capability (col. 4, lines 42-46). Therefore, since units 108 and 110 essentially house an application which would invoke a signing interface, there would be no reason to transmit such an application from unit 106 to unit 104. To do so would be redundant. Thus, Godfrey fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1.

Independent claim 21 also recites “a signing interface, the signing interface adapted to be invoked by a Web application transmitted to the browser from a remote location.” Thus, claim 21 is allowable for the same reasons claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-20 and 22-40 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 41-45 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Godfrey in view of Gibbs (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,321). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 41 recites “means for downloading a Web application from the second-customer computer system to the browser.” As stated previously, Godfrey fails to disclose that a web application is transmitted from unit 106 to unit 104. Since units 108 and 110 essentially house an application which would invoke a signing interface, there would be no reason to transmit such an application from unit 106 to unit 104. Again, this would be redundant. Gibbs likewise fails to disclose this feature. Therefore, neither Godfrey nor Gibbs disclose or suggest the features of claim 41, either alone or in combination.

Claim 45 essentially recites the above-discussed feature from claim 41. Specifically, claim 45 recites that the second customer serves Web pages to the first customer, which is not disclosed by Godfrey or Gibbs.

The remaining claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 12, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Godfrey in view of Dancs (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,651). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 11 and 12, and 31 and 32 depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively. As discussed above, Godfrey fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1 and 21. Dancs likewise fails to teach or suggest the above-discussed features which Godfrey fails to disclose, thus claims 11, 12, 31 and 32 are allowable for the reasons stated above. Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 388022001900.

Dated: March 25, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
2000 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006
202-778-1646